DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 851 EA 025 228

AUTHOR Barkley, Robert, Jr.; Castle, Shari
TITLE Principles and Actions: A Framework for Systemic Change.
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Learning Laboratories; *Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; Organizational Communication; *Organizational Theories; Participative Decision Making; Power Structure; *School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS National Education Association

ABSTRACT

This paper outlines a framework designed to help school districts evaluate themselves during the implementation of systemic change. Based on the experiences of districts that participated in the NEA Learning Laboratories Initiative, a process called "rapporteuring" was developed. The process provokes the particular site into serious reflection through tapping the organization's "grapevine." Data on nine participating school districts were obtained from interviews and site visits. Twelve systemic change principles emerged from the data: (1) the purpose must be clearly articulated and widely "known and owned"; (2) the purpose must be based on a consciously developed philosophy and rooted in shared theory; (3) the need for change must be understood and accepted; (4) the "top" must demonstrate the envisioned change; (5) significant new investment must be made in educating/training prospective participants in the new philosophy/theory and relevant skills; (6) participation in the new processes and approaches must be voluntary and active; (7) power sources and relationships must be visibly altered; (8) partner-customer-supplier relationships must be consciously developed; (9) individual affirmation must be balanced with collaboration; (10) processes at all levels must be emphasized over end results; (11) communication barriers must be eradicated; (12) data-based decision making must be required and enabled; and (13) efforts to learn and improve must be total, dynamic, and generative. Eight tables are included. Appendices contain a comparison of evaluation paradigms and a copy of the rapporteur schedule and interview guide. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 851

Principles and Actions: A Framework for Systemic Change

Robert Barkley, Jr.

Shari Castle

NEA National Center for Innovation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Barkley, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper to be presented as part of the symposium, "District-Wide Change: Frameworks, Evidence of Progress, Visions, Research Questions, and Collaboration," at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA, April 1993.

EA 025 228

The authors wish to acknowledge the valuable contribution of Beverly Johnson whose data collection and field work formed the basis of this paper.

Background

The recent efforts of the National Education Association (NEA) to venture into the arena of systemic change started with the Mastery In Learning Project, a building-based, faculty-led school change effort, dating back to 1985 (Livingston & Castle, 1992; McClure, 1991). That effort, reborn as today's Mastery In Learning Consortium, taught us that individual schools/faculties could change, but such change would most often **not** effect neighboring schools - even those in the same district. Further, we learned that such changes would seldom be sustained in a particular school without extraordinary independence from the school district and/or extraordinary dependence on external support. Also, it was seldom sustained without maintaining a very fragile chemistry between specific personalities. In other words, the traditional school district system will eventually "chew up" any building-specific changes it does not understand nor embrace. In biological terms, we know that healthy human systems have the capacity and the inclination to reject foreign objects or elements. This is true, as well, of organizational systems, healthy or not.

This predictable, but still unexpected, conclusion led NEA to seek change at a more predictably sustainable level - the district itself. In 1988, then NEA President Mary Hatwood Futrell announced the concept of the Learning Laboratories Initiative. The Initiative was designed to identify one district in each of the fifty states where each of the key stakeholder groups in that community would commit, as partners one with the other, to a reform journey. Each applicant along the way (there are currently twenty states where districts have been designated) has framed their starting point and initial focus differently. There was no model and were very few basic principles in place at the outset, only the expectation that the players would learn and share together. That expectation remains in place today.

In May of 1989, four districts became the first Labs. The next year five more were added. It soon became apparent that the expectation that things would be learned was true. However, the process for capturing and sharing such learnings was a dilemma (Johnson, 1992; see Appendix A). Several methods were used, but the culmination of that effort was the

development of a process we now label "rapporteuring." The dictionary defines rapporteuring as reporting out, but we understand that in French it actually means "tattletaling." Both definitions have turned out to be accurate and helpful.

In reporting out, there is little attempt to protect anyone from the harsh messages - some highly personal - which such a procedure uncovers. It is acknowledged that the process is subjective in that the interviewees are not randomly selected, but every care is taken to insure that the report accurately reflects the perceptions of the interviewed parties. During the 1990-91 and 1991-92 schools years, nine districts were "rapporteured." With few exceptions the key parties in each district have been surprised by the insightfulness, comprehensiveness, and fairness of the report.

The rapporteur process has been described as tapping an organization's grapevine. We know that grapevines are usually highly accurate but unreliable sources. That is, while 85% of the information one generates from the grapevine may be accurate, it is very difficult for those tapping in to determine which 85% is accurate. It may be that everything is about 85% correct, or that 100% of some data is correct and 100% of other data is incorrect. Correctness is not the issue. The issue is to provoke the particular site into serious reflection and validation regarding what is reported - to get the organization to hold up a mirror to itself and deal with what it sees. W. Edwards Deming, among others, has told us that "organizations can't see themselves." Organizations need outsiders - "critical friends" - to nudge them into such reflection and, hopefully, corresponding action. The rapporteur process has done this.

What has now occurred is that, out of the process of rapporteuring and other supporting mechanisms, we still have no model. However, we are beginning to develop a framework that will enable districts to guide and evaluate themselves on the systemic change journey. This paper is our first formal version of that framework. However, it is still a work in progress.

Process for Development of a Framework

Principles

One of our objectives was to integrate various writings on systemic change from business and education. Currently, there are many criteria suggested for designing and/or analyzing the merits of systemic change efforts. We selected five authors who have written about, researched, or are fairly well-known for their work on systemic change. All of the authors have identified elements of successful change initiatives. We selected some with a business orientation and some with an education orientation. These five sources are representative of major efforts at analyzing school and organizational change. The sources include the following. W. Edwards Deming is the recognized guru of the Japanese industrial renaissance and of America's new interest in quality (Walton, 1986). Michael Fullan is the Dean of Education at the University of Toronto and one of the world's foremost analysts of school improvement efforts (Fullan, 1991). Seymour Sarason is a long time denizen in the world of school change (Sarason, 1990). Myron Tribus, recently retired as Director of the Center for Advanced Engineering Study at MIT, is an essayist in the field of quality principles applied to schooling (Tribus, 1992). Joann Neuroth has recently completed a project supported by the Joyce Foundation to translate for educational application the Malcolm Baldrige Award criteria which were originally designed to recognize quality practices in business (Neuroth, 1992). The Baldrige program is administered by the U.S. Commerce Department and there has been legislation introduced to move those efforts into the educational arena. These five resources give a mix of perspectives from both inside and outside established educational circles. Table 1 provides lists of elements from these five sources.

We then compared the elements from the five authors and gleaned a set of principles that reflect their elements and are also consistent with our experience in the NEA Learning Labs. We have a growing body of experience, derived from a variety of locales and observers, which lends evidence to this set of principles. The criteria from the five sources in Table 1

provides a broad context in which to construct the principles and provides language with which to discuss them.

We used a grid to chart the elements by the principles (see Table 2), then revised and combined the principles until they were as succinct as possible. While the language is not identical, all of the elements from Table 1 appear in some form in the principles and vice versa (see Table 3).

Rapporteur Findings

Another of our objectives was to investigate systemic change as it is playing out in actual sites. To do this, we used the Rapporteur Reports in two ways: 1) to inform the gleaning of the principles; and 2) to add operational substance to the principles.

The rapporteur process. As programs complete their second year of partnership with the Center, a program review is conducted in the spirit of critical friendship. That is, a review is conducted by persons familiar with the Center's purpose, yet outside the particular program. The review is intended to provide information helpful to the progress of the particular Learning Lab, as well as to inform the participating reviewers for application in their home sites. As mentioned earlier, the review team consists of 6-8 people: 2 Center staff, and 4-6 from other Labs selected from among the following role groups: teachers, principals, central office staff, Association staff, parents, business partners, researchers. Each Team member receives a copy of the Lab's initial application for review prior to the visit. The Rapporteur Team conducts two days of intensive interviews with internal and external stakeholders (see Schedule Overview and Interview Questions in Appendix B). Interviews are conducted with individuals or small groups by a dyad from the Rapporteur Team and copious notes are taken. The interview data are analyzed through an interactive classification process for themes and patterns that are organized according to Praises, Nudges, and Cautions. Quotes from the interview notes are included. Drawing from their collective personal experience and professional expertise, the Team members offer possible strategies which the local site might use to guide their continuing work. The findings of the Rapporteur Team are shared in an

oral report-out on the third day. The report-out is videotaped for later sharing among stakeholders unable to be present. A few weeks later, a written report is sent to the site. A follow-up visit is conducted each succeeding year by a Center staff person to review progress.

Strengths and weaknesses of data. The Rapporteur Report has both strengths and weaknesses as data. Strengths include responsiveness to the local context and the complexity of change, the expertise of outside observers who are involved in similar initiatives, its collaborative nature built on what was observed at the site, its cyclical design with recurring visits, and its formative nature. Weaknesses include its potential lack of representativeness (because interviewees are selected by the local site and are not randomly sampled), and, again, its formative nature. The formative nature of the Rapporteur process means that learnings are constantly being integrated and applied. This is desirable and necessary in an initiative with few precedents, one in which the goal is continuous learning and inquiry, and in which the data's first purpose is to assist the local site. However, this means that each report integrates the learnings from the previous reports, thus making direct comparisons questionable and statistical analysis inappropriate. Still, we find these data extremely useful and insightful as long as the caveats are kept in mind.

Data sources and sites. The sources of data for this analysis include the first nine Rapporteur Reports conducted between May, 1991 and June, 1992. The sites are not named in this paper, but their demographics are as follows:

--1 medium-sized district in a small city

--1 large urban district

--2 small, rural districts

--4 medium-sized districts in large towns

--1 large suburban district

Data analysis. An iterative coding process was used to identify themes in the nine reports; three iterations were conducted. Praises and Nudges were done separately. These themes were listed and categorized and a final iteration was conducted to assure that the

categories were comprehensive, but not repetitive. The sites were mapped onto the categories (see Tables 4 and 5). The Praises and Nudges categories were then combined into one category system (see Table 6). Then the final categorization was compared against the principles (see Table 8) and, finding the principles sufficient, we mapped the categories onto the principles creating a framework that is both general and operational (see Table 7).

Case Study

The objective of the second paper in this symposium is to provide a more in depth look at and richer description of change in one district and to further inform the appropriateness and usefulness of the framework.

Feedback

Because this is a formative process, we have developed several ways of exposing the framework to critical thinking and activity. 1) The principles have been presented for discussion and feedback at the NEA Learning Labs Task Force meeting and at the NEA Western States Regional Conference for feedback. 2) The framework (which includes the principles and the operational categories) will be presented at AACTE and AERA for additional critique. After presentation of the two papers, invited researchers with expertise in systemic change will lead small discussion groups and write a critique based on their knowledge and the group 's discussion. 3) As follow-up Rapporteur visits are conducted, the results will be mapped onto the categories. 4) As another test of the framework's usefulness, the principles will be used as overarching categories for analysis and organization of the Rapporteur interviews. This will serve to inform the principles and the operational categories giving us some indication of the usefulness of the framework in a practical setting.

After each of the above activities, the results will be used to revise and refine the principles and the categories.

We do not yet know all we will learn from this project. Indeed, Deming tells us that what we will need to know tomorrow "is both unknown and unknowable." That somewhat troubling and humbling thought aside, we have nonetheless attempted to reflect on and learn

from our experience thus far. The process used was one of studying current organizational development and change theory and research, and then reflecting upon it in the context of the Learning Lab experience.

Systemic Change Principles

1. Purpose must be clearly articulated and widely "known and owned"
2. Purpose must be based upon a consciously developed philosophy rooted in shared theory
3. Need for change must be broadly understood and accepted
4. The "top" must demonstrate the envisioned change
5. Significant new investment and commitment must be made in educating/training prospective participants in the new theory and philosophy and relevant skills
6. Participation in the new processes and approaches must be voluntary and active
7. Power sources and relationships must be visibly altered
8. Partner-customer-supplier relationships must be consciously developed
9. Individual affirmation must be balanced with collaboration
10. Processes, at all levels, must be emphasized over end results
11. Communication barriers must be eradicated
12. Data-based decision making must be required and enabled
13. Efforts to learn and improve must be total, dynamic, and generative

The degree to which the presence of the above principles are met by our Learning Labs determines the presence of and/or the prospect for systemic change. These criteria are not unique to schools, as evidenced by the elements listed in Table 1. Schools are organizations not unlike others. The efforts of schools to change, like those of other organizations, will flounder to the extent they are unsuccessful in attending to and accomplishing the ingredients of change represented by such principles. Following is an elaboration on each of these principles.

1. Purpose must be clearly articulated and widely known and owned.

What is the purpose of schooling? There is every indication that one could not get agreement to the answer in but a very small percentage of school faculty lounges around this nation. Further, little effort is expended at causing consensus on such a fundamental topic. The perceived purpose of education can remain different even within the vocational wing of our high schools and certainly can remain so between that wing and the academic areas. The three fifth grade teachers in a single elementary school can survive entire careers without even discussing this subject among themselves, much less with the rest of the faculty. When was the last time teachers and parents at the PTA meeting, or in any other forum, attempted to reach consensus on the purpose of schooling? When have there been serious attempts at reaching such consensus between central office personnel and a local faculty or between the area teacher education faculty and a local district central office staff or school faculty?

Assuming consensus could be reached, what might it be? Two attractive alternatives are: 1) increased human capacity, and 2) creating maximum lifetime options for students. To be effective there must be agreement and ownership of an answer. Once consensus is reached among all stakeholders, there will also need to be agreement on what the indicators are that there has been some legitimate pursuit of the agreed purpose. The process of reaching consensus around purpose and identifying indicators is the beginning of systemic thinking and basic to improvement.

One of the most often expressed comments we hear from the "trenches" is, "what does all this have to do with my real job?" Most teachers seem to have the impression, quite understandably, that they are not doing "their job" unless they are in a classroom with students. Their attitude toward meetings held to decide on a district or school purpose and vision, or to learn new skills such as consensus decision making, is that it's extra work - work one does in addition to what one is really hired to do. We believe the extent to which this view is held is so great that the determination of purpose must include determination of corresponding role re-definitions for just about everyone in the system. One is not a true participant in a system

unless they devote energies to sustaining and improving the system, as well as to their particular function within the system.

It occurs to the authors that we will have taken great strides in this role re-definition when to the question, "What do you do?," teachers begin to answer by saying something like, "Oh, I work for a learning organization. I work with a team of folks who work together to cause greater appreciation for learning and to organize an environment where all parties learn and share as much as possible." This alternative response would not only generate greater pride in teaching, but it would begin to reflect a more fuller understanding of a purpose of schooling - certainly fuller than the typical, almost apologetic, response of, "Oh, I teach second grade."

2. Purpose must be based upon a consciously developed philosophy rooted in shared theory.

A theory is something you believe (would bet your life on) to the extent that you will modify your behavior to live by it even though you can not entirely prove it. Whether the earth is flat or round (or at least almost round), or whether the sun or the earth is the center of our solar system are two classic examples of once conflicting theories.

In organizational development, the primary theory in question here has to do with whether extrinsic or intrinsic motivation should be the basis for causing work to get done. Do all children want to learn or do they have to be externally motivated to learn? Do all employees want to do a good job, or do we have to externally entice them to do good work and to improve their effectiveness? Do we believe that an atmosphere of competitiveness is more productive than one of cooperation? As Stephen Covey (1989) suggests, are we "trying to get the fruits of cooperation from a paradigm of competition." Covey further suggests, "...you can't change the fruit without changing the root."

Competition is so "socially" accepted as the best way to stimulate productivity that it is difficult for people to quickly and easily accept the theory of cooperation. This is so despite the fact that the tremendous majority of people indicate that in regard to themselves, an atmosphere of cooperation would be more effective than one of competition. This disparity

between how we structure our organizations and what we feel most influences us personally, is even greater regarding our views on the impact of extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation. Most of us, in overwhelming numbers it seems, feel we are sufficiently motivated to do our best work if our organization would just give us a fair shot. However, we quite remarkably treat others (students in our classrooms or persons under our supervision) as if they feel otherwise - as if some external motivation will cause good work.

The answer to the foregoing questions lies in behavior which often belies the rhetoric. Those who believe in personnel appraisal systems, merit pay or other pay for performance schemes, honor rolls, grading, etc., probably also believe people need external stimulus to do a good job. The issue is not what theory one subscribes to, but that what individuals actually do in any enterprise is based upon a thoroughly developed theory which they all understand and employ consistently in their work. Commitment to the theory may be even more important than its accuracy. Commitment to the theory is truly more important, it seems, when the theory is dynamic and constantly under scrutiny and refinement. Thus, individuals and groups need constantly to be reflecting upon the appropriateness and accuracy of their theories as they work.

The theory one ascribes to their work becomes the basis for a philosophy and for the set of beliefs and values they apply. One's philosophy is their behavior - their basis for personal action. Their philosophy for action needs to be consistent with their theory. The criteria for assessing systemic change dictates that to be effective, the development of the theories and corresponding philosophy for action has been rigorously and consciously developed and adopted across the organization. In fact, the most important aspect of this principle is acceptance that the effort must be very deliberate and conscious.

Development of a consciously and openly developed philosophy for action is required to achieve the "collective reality" of Peter Senge (Senge, 1992). In the effective organization, the collection of players all share the same sense of what is real, what is important, and which direction everyone is headed.

3. Need for change must be understood and accepted.

This principle is inextricably linked to the first principle regarding purpose. Under the first principle the focus was on the "purpose of the enterprise itself." Here the issue is the need for the particular change in theory, philosophy, values and practices used to pursue the agreed purpose. It seems that most practitioners in education have not yet accepted the proposition that schools are as bad as many opinion leaders suggest, or even that schools need to, or can be, improved. Many schools also suffer from an elusion of powerlessness, convinced they are entirely at the mercy of outside influences and resources to dictate their effectiveness and efficiency. Unless these positions are altered, our experience is that no meaningful change will occur.

"Change is constant, but growth is optional" is a quote attributed to several observers of change efforts. In general the experience across the Learning Labs seems to support this statement. Every Lab is experiencing much change, but the growth required to accept change as an opportunity varies widely. However, this quote serves little purpose as it stands. Clearly, if a school, or district, or state system is to change, the key implementers must 1) be convinced that change is necessary, 2) have some loose, but cohesive image of what the changes might look like, and maybe most important of all, 3) be afforded the opportunity to develop understanding and comfort with the new approach(es).

No matter how well conceived or how appropriate, change efforts seem rarely to get past this threshold principle which requires understanding and acceptance by those with basic implementation responsibilities.

4. The "top" must demonstrate the envisioned change.

The "top" is chiefly the superintendent. However, assuming a wider definition is best. The "top" means any one in organization's bureaucratic leadership circle who is visible to those charged with primary implementation responsibility. Yes, it starts with the superintendent, but the entire central office, building level management, and employee organization leadership are also part of this wider definition of the "top." These are the people who can move or block

change. They are the influencers. This is where the "touch labor" (Dolan, 1989; 1992) gets its signals about what is expected. ("Touch labor" is a label describing those members of any enterprise who actually "touch" the product, or in the context of education, "directly implement the actual learning strategies.")

The "top" must display that things are different in everything they do - consistently and passionately. Behavior at the top exemplifies what is valued and honored and what is not (i.e., are appointments made, or appear to be made, on the basis of personal loyalty or on the basis of professional competence). The degree to which this occurs will, above all else, determine what fork in the road to change is taken, or whether any movement occurs at all.

What this principle suggests, in our experience at least, is the need for a massive and long term initial investment in getting this "top" group prepared and committed. This is where the superintendent is the "top" among "tops." He/she must lead and facilitate this aspect of the change effort. This cannot be skipped and probably cannot be shortcut or be delegated. Further, the primary demonstration of this leadership activity seems to be the active and regular attendance - possibly even as a lead facilitator - of the "top" in the training and education processes of formulating and learning the new theory, philosophy, and skills.

In other words, nothing would deliver the message more clearly than a superintendent, long noted for regular attendance at the weekly Kiwanis or Rotary club luncheons, foregoing this to attend a training program alongside staff. Put succinctly, you can't change things without changing something!

In our definition of the "top," we have included the teacher organization leadership. Considerable research shows that teacher unions need not be any obstacle to school improvement, In fact, several researchers suggest they have been substantial contributors to several school reform efforts (McDonnell & Pascal, 1988; Kerchner, Koppich & King, undated). Our experience is that a key to their constructive involvement is their organizational security and the encouragement they receive from state and other local affiliates. It is just as difficult for the local union officer to step out from his/her peers on

matters of school reform as it is for school administrators to step out from their colleagues in neighboring schools and districts. We are social animals who seek acceptance from our respected counterparts. This phenomenon suggests that one of the greatest contributions the NEA Learning Laboratory Initiative has made to school improvement is the formulation of the personal and organizational support group necessary to establish sufficient security for risk-taking among member schools and districts.

A subtle but important point needs emphasis. This principle does not infer that change can only **start at the top**. Indeed, we sense that it can start in a variety of places within and without the formal organizational structure. However, in order for the change to become systemic, it must eventually be adopted and vigorously displayed by those we call the "top."

Additionally, successful change can not remain only at the top. As indicated under principle #3, there must be acceptance and understanding throughout the organization. In other words, the top can't simply mandate change and delegate its implementation, but must define it and nurture it personally across the organization.

5. Significant new investment must be made in educating/training prospective participants in the new philosophy/theory and relevant skills.

It has been long known by insiders and is now noted by many outsiders (Myron Tribus, 1992, for one) to the educational establishment, that the paltry investment of schools in staff development, along with the "concept of the year" design of such efforts, demonstrates like little else why schools have not changed effectively over time.

Most of the current teacher and administrator work force was trained along the lines of extrinsic motivation being primary. That is, they came into their positions having been taught and treated in such ways that suggest you must, by persuasion and/or threat, get pupils to learn or teachers to care about their effectiveness. Fear then, often in the subtlest of forms, is viewed as the primary stimulus. To begin operating on the theory that students want to learn, and simply need meaning to be present in the learning opportunity in order for them to be actively engaged, changes both the role to be played and the skills to be applied by teachers.

This will take new education and training. Likewise, if principals are to see their tasks primarily as facilitator, coach, and model, rather than overseer and monitor, new education and training will be required.

Those of us who provide training seem to be of a consensus that "just in time training" may be the best. The most effective time for training is when meaning and application occur simultaneously with the training experience. This view is inconsistent with most schools' staff development programs and will require a training readiness not available in many districts.

Covey (1989) talks of the need for individuals and organizations to acquire a balance between investment in productivity (P) itself and the development of increased capacity to be productive (PC). One can spend so much time in production that the increased capacity necessary to maintain effectiveness is ignored, or one can spend so much time developing capacity that no production occurs. Effective organizations need to balance these two functions. Schools appear seriously out of balance toward the expectation for productivity with little tolerance for investment in the enhancement of productive capacity. All of this will be of increased importance when a new theory and a new philosophy for action - indeed a new culture - is being developed.

Further, such an investment in training requires that the role re-definition mentioned earlier be well established along with a parallel re-definition of the expectations for how teachers, and others, spend their time. An investment in training, when those being trained don't understand or accept their reason for being there, will be resources poorly spent.

6. Participation in the new processes and approaches must be voluntary and active.

The first three principles build the case for identifying organizational purpose, developing a cogent theory and corresponding philosophy for action, and establishing among the organization stakeholders the need for a particular change. All this is required because experience has shown us that reluctant participation is ineffective. If the new theory and philosophy has truly generated commitment, then voluntary application will occur across all opportunities. Such commitment is necessary for the desired scope of cultural change to

occur. If one is not getting voluntary participation, a return to the developmental phases regarding theory and philosophy is called for.

The ultimate power in schools lies with students. That is, they may chose to learn or not. Even their decision not to learn will cause them to learn, although not to learn what is desired by the organization. Within schools' delivery structures, however, teachers have the ultimate power. That is, they, in their usual isolation from any substantive professional daily contact with colleagues, have the power to implement or not the suggested instructional strategies and curriculum. Management has the power to control conditions, to set the climate, to open or close access to resources, but they do not have the power to implement the ultimate strategies without the voluntary cooperation of teachers and students. "Touch labor" is where it's at! The "top" is powerless without the "bottom."

Consequently, if management wishes more than mere reluctant compliance, they must increase the degree of voluntary commitment by reducing fear of risk, encouraging creativity, and establishing understanding and comfort with the desired theory, philosophy, and practices. Further such voluntary participation cannot be passive - bordering on reluctant compliance only. Passive volunteerism does not engender the creative potential of the entire faculty which then limits the desired outcomes.

7. Power sources and relationships must be visibly altered.

Sarason (1990) rightly points out that for some time "teachers almost totally lacked power either in terms of 'control over' anyone or 'the ability to act or produce an effect.'" He further points out that simply changing the power relationships within an organization (school) will not by itself increase productivity nor improve outcomes. However, changing power relationships is necessary to pave the way for the possibility of change. The experience from the Learning Laboratories supports this conclusion and NEA members have argued this for decades.

In the most progressive Labs, examples of considerably altered power relationships include the way decisions are made, who is involved in what decisions, who has control over

discretionary budgets, the way in which managers are selected, who gets what training and the makeup of the training group (managers, teachers, and parents learning together). Teachers are increasingly involved in the selection of principals, and teachers are increasingly partners with the Boards of Education in selecting the superintendent.

A story from one Lab illustrates this latter development. A small elementary school was asked, for fiscal reasons, to operate as a committee of the whole without a principal. This functioned well for awhile, but soon that faculty decided they wanted a principal again. Having become familiar with the previously unknown functions of a principal, they developed new appreciation for many of those functions. They decided they did not want to play all of them any longer, but wished to retain some. They requested the selection of a principal and were involved in that selection process. The point is that this new principal now has their position and the functions of the position have been structured at the behest of the faculty rather than through the good graces of some traditional top-down selection process. This is the sort of power relationship and power source change which can foster greater teamwork and greater empowerment of "touch labor."

Several sites have taken only the first step to changing power relationships. That is, they have ventured, unfortunately, into the largely cosmetic steps of including other stakeholders in the "official" decision making structure. However, when one observes these new groups in their decision making activity, the discussion is still heavily dominated by the traditional holders of power. It is arguable that such changes are a necessary first step. It is equally arguable that, without strong pressure to nurture total involvement of the new players, nothing much will change. Our experience indicates that the new players in the decision making loop will need training in trust-building, assertiveness, consensus-building, and other such skills in order to use their new access to power effectively. They will need unbridled access to necessary information.

No one should underestimate the strength it will take for many people to give up the real and perceived power of position. Many have followed long established "rules of the game"

to achieve their professional status. We have found those in traditional power positions to take their responsibilities very seriously. They do not perceive that they are in any way wielding their influence improperly or ineffectively. Only the very sturdiest of egos will be able to withstand the shocking realization that just maybe the hierarchical position they occupy and the attending behavior they display are quite possibly both unnecessary and ineffective.

8. Partner-customer-supplier relationships must be consciously developed.

The terms "customer" and "supplier" are foreign ones in education. Indeed, the determination of just who one's customer is which seems so much easier for most profit-making and service industries to determine, can be the subject of lengthy debates among school folks. As there is difficulty in reaching consensus on the purpose of schooling, there is parallel difficulty deciding on the customer.

We have watched and participated in some of this debate at various Labs. The debate must begin by identification of the product of schooling. This is related closely to the purpose of schooling discussion under the first principle. If the product is learning itself, and the purposes are the increasing of general human capacity and the broadening of the lifetime options available to the successful learner, than whoever benefits, ultimately, from that learning is the customer. It's much more complex than the student or parent being the customer. The student **is** the customer of the actual instructional processes, but they are certainly only one customer of the ultimate learning and increased human capacity which hopefully takes place.

It is an interesting conclusion of discussing this topic, that, while the student is occasionally in the role of customer, they are more often in the role of co-producer of the product along with the teacher(s). The parent might also be thought of as a co-producer. The teacher in such a scheme of things becomes the sort of "technical advisor" to a home-student-teacher-faculty partnership responsible for learning (the "product"). This construct releases the individual teacher from the inappropriate shackles of sole responsibility for whether a student learns, brings the parent and student into things with greater responsibility, requires a

collaborative faculty support system, and clarifies the individual teacher's legitimate role. The central office, principal, and other faculty, and students' previous teachers all become suppliers to the ultimate learning group of student-teacher-home.

The relationships suggested in the foregoing discussion can only occur, being so foreign to what now exists in most schools, as a result of conscious deliberation and dialogue. Such relationships are now being nurtured in some Labs. Everyone feels awkward and unsure of themselves as the change occurs. There are "implementation dips," as Michael Fullan (1991) might call them, in the development of this new learning construct. That is, this developmental process is not linear and smooth, and, under stress, the parties will often retreat to the comfort of their traditional roles. However, it appears from our vantage point that movement toward such a different view of relationships, coupled with the changing power picture described under the previous principle, offers the greatest hope for substantive change to take place.

Also, as mentioned in the discussion under principle four regarding the "top," the teacher-to-teacher-association relationship changes. This means that the association needs to find ways to support and enhance a climate conducive to this new "learning partnership" and "customer-supplier" arrangement. As the system thinkers (Senge, et al) point out, in essence, "you can't puncture one part of the bubble without significant impact on the remainder."

This construct of relationships also begins to sound like systemic thinking (Senge, 1990). A system is a series of processes with a common aim. We all work in some sort of system. However, we are really not part of the system itself if we only play a narrowly defined function buried somewhere within the system. That is, teachers are not really part of the system if they only teach in their classroom and do nothing to sustain and improve the total system. Retreating to the isolation of the classroom is denial of responsibility for the health of the system. Responsibility for the system rather than just one's own part is something most workers - even in professions - never bargained for. It is a very threatening proposition to

many, but it is the essence of empowerment. Empowerment means having the responsibility **and** the capacity to impact the system.

9. Individual affirmation must be balanced with collaboration.

Again, Stephen Covey (1989) offers insight by suggesting that individuals cannot enter into successful interdependent relationships without first satisfying their need for independence. People do not enter into the deep collaborative professional relationships we might hope for until and unless they are comfortable with their personal professional competence and their capacity to design, implement, and innovate with professional strategies without fear of failure. Only when people are at ease with their own professional theories and philosophy will they entertain those of others. Only then can professional collaboration occur.

What this suggests organizationally is that unless an atmosphere of professional independence has been established, it will be exceedingly difficult to move to a collaborative one. The traditionally authoritative administrator will probably not be successful in moving his/her faculty to highly collaborative behavior unless that faculty first moves away from dependence on such an authority figure and/or dependence upon a rigid curriculum and prescriptive instructional strategies.

Another angle on individual versus organizational readiness for change is displayed in morale. This also relates to the theory of extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation. The attitude that low morale is caused largely by the benefits ones receives in return for their work suggests belief in extrinsic motivation. As Herzberg points out in his now famous research, benefit issues are largely "dissatisfiers." That is, low morale will most assuredly occur with individuals and groups that do not feel they are treated fairly in comparison to accepted norms. However, meeting or exceeding such norms does not cause increased morale. What, then, is the cause of morale levels where norms are met or exceeded? Our observation of the Learning Labs indicates that morale is determined largely by the congruency between the individual (teacher, parent, principal, Board member, etc.) and the organizational philosophy and readiness for change.

The sum of this is that only individuals with a high sense of professional independence and with a philosophy congruent to that of the organization will feel high morale and be able and willing to contribute to a collaborative work environment. Organizations must invest unpredictable amounts of resources and commitment to create such balance and such congruency. One of the most often made mistakes occurring in today's rush to shared decision making at the building level is neglect of the assessment and development of individual affirmation. Successful collaboration takes place among professionally confident individuals.

This is a very significant concept and hard to grasp. It appears that most changing organizations have not given it much thought, and we discovered no conscious effort to accomplish such balance. This principle does, however, explain why so many schools have great difficulty moving to a successful shared decision making model.

10. Processes, at all levels, must be emphasized over end results.

As mentioned earlier, a system is a series of processes with a common aim. We've talked at length about the various aspects of establishing an organization wide "aim" that is owned by all participants. However, zealous focus on the aim can translate to attention to results only. This ignores systems thinking and suggests that a system is a series of results rather than a series of processes. Results are descriptive of the aim and are indicators of the success of the processes employed. It remains, however, to alter the processes if one wishes to alter the results.

The revelation that processes determine results causes the enlightened individual and organization to consciously and continuously reflect upon processes. Most schools do not do this. Although it seems to come somewhat naturally to many individual teachers, they would likely not call it "process reflection." The first step toward a process focus is mapping existing processes. One process is the whole area of homework. Another might be how class absences influence student assessment and performance expectations. Other processes are curriculum development, instructional supplies purchasing, how vacancies are filled, budget determination, and staff development programs.

Focusing on processes means entering upon an unending journey. It is and must become a new way of thinking quite different from focusing upon results. This is the essence of what Deming taught the Japanese (Walton, 1986) and what businesspersons are struggling with today across the globe. In the business world, an entire area of expertise has developed around quality control. Traditionally, quality control has been intent upon inspection, chiefly at the end of the line. In schools this philosophy is exemplified by standardized testing. In both schools and businesses, results are assessed after established processes are largely completed. In such an approach, processes may be altered after the fact to remain in place until flaws are revealed by another round of end of the line inspections. Or there may be intervention strategies arranged to help "fix" the flaws. A lot of resources are invested in determining results and intervention. What Deming and others tell us is that these costs can be reduced when processes are continuously reviewed and improved **by those actually engaged in the processes**. This approach is much more efficient in all regards than is end of the line inspection.

Another lesson from business quality control experts is that setting standards is crucial. However, the standards need to be established for the processes and not just for the results. In fact, setting standards for system results is largely meaningless, while setting standards for processes will have substantial effect on all results. Setting standards in this way is quite new for schools and has really not yet occurred in any Labs.

Reflecting upon and improving processes in an organized way is a characteristic of effective people (Covey, 1989). However, most teachers are not taught to do this nor how to do it. The Learning Labs project has made available expert assistance to requesting sites in the concept of "action research." This is a series a techniques and practices by which individuals and groups engage in research (reflection) on their actions (processes). This concept has been enthusiastically embraced by many educators introduced to it, which supports the theory of the dominance of intrinsic motivation. That is, **we have found that teachers and faculties really want to do a good job and to constantly improve if they are truly**

encouraged and enabled to do so. Action research very simply means consciously determining (planning) strategies (processes) to be used, taking stock of the timely results of said strategies, reflecting upon the planned results and the actual results, making the indicated adjustments in the processes, and standardizing the processes until further adjustment is suggested. To use the Deming cycle, it means plan, do, check, act, plan, do, check, act, etc. Some undetermined sole said, "Growth occurs when one studies the area of difference between what is planned and what actually occurs." It might be concluded then that growth will not occur for those who do not engage in such study.

A reader of an early draft of this paper commented that, "we should run our classrooms this way too - with an emphasis on process rather than results." Another reader noted that teacher appraisal would have to change considerably, in their experience, to move away from the results only orientation.

11. Communications barriers must be eradicated.

This comes directly from Deming (Walton, 1986). It also comes directly from every systems thinking, change oriented source, and from the experience of the Learning Labs Initiative itself. Deming talks of getting rid of change barriers **and structures.** Traditional hierarchical bureaucracies are communications structures. Decision making authority and responsibility represent a communication structure. Thus, it can be interpreted that this principle means doing away with hierarchy, with bureaucracy, and with decision making vested in positions (titles) rather than with those most capable.

It is a barrier to communication when one must talk only to those in charge rather than to others engaged in the actual work - to other "touch labor." Students are "touch labor" in the sense of learning, while teachers are the "touch labor" in the sense of teaching. A vertical rather than horizontal communication structure slows down process reflection and adjustment. "Asking permission" is a communications control structure. Having students work on assignments independently rather than cooperatively not only establishes the paradigm of competition, it creates a communication barrier which frustrates learning.

This principle might better be stated positively that **structures must be established which enhance communications among those most responsible for the work.** One of the traits of many progressive school organizations is that so much innovation is going on that there is little "connectedness" between the various efforts. Such connectedness occurs through communications. One of the contributions of the Learning Lab site coordinating councils can be their enhancement of communications between previously very separate process improvements.

We suggest, but do not require (consistent with our "no model" project philosophy) that each site establish some sort of project governance council. The usual name for these groups has been "the vertical team." This name now seems too hierarchical, as does the very word "governance," and we guide new sites away from it toward something akin to "the quality guidance team," or "the quality leadership council." (There is more to the label we give such structures than we at first realized.) However, a carry over from the original name, vertical team, is the expectation that such councils represent "a vertical slice" of the district and thereby include **all** stakeholders.

One of the common difficulties of the Labs has been determining exactly what are the functions of any site project governance council. Consistent with established bureaucracy is the expectation that such groups should "make decisions," and, indeed, most of these groups struggle with determining exactly what decisions they should make which do not place them in direct conflict with some other well established decision making authority. It is interesting to note the perception this reveals - that unless you make decisions, you have no power and are relatively insignificant.

Our experience has led us to the position that these councils have two primary responsibilities. First, they must do whatever is necessary in order to model the envisioned new behavior. Secondly, they must develop the capacity to facilitate change across the system. Such facilitation involves the myriad new skills necessary to behave collaboratively and systemically and it covers a wide spectrum from consensus decision making to the use of

statistics. Both of these responsibilities involve decision making, but the emphasis is on two functions distinctly absent in most school districts and which are, therefore, duties unique to the new group. While these functions may still be threatening to existing authority groups, they are nonetheless outwardly not in conflict with the official expectations of the roles of these more traditional groups.

In addition to the two primary functions of the new project council, two secondary functions have emerged. They can and probably should serve to connect the various improvement efforts underway across the district. This leads to the other function which is establishing horizontal communications structures and mechanisms. Interestingly, it could be argued that these functions are, or at least should be, part of the traditional managerial function. Our experience is, however, that these roles are not dealt with well unless specific responsibility exists. Our experience indicates that making "improved communication" everybody's business ends up making it nobody's precise responsibility! We have come to advocate that very specific "worriers" be designated for such things as communications and connecting.

Once all the important readiness principles are dealt with, it eventually comes down to better communications being at the core of any continuous improvement journey.

12. Data-based decision making must be required and enabled.

Nothing seems to have caused more change in the actual classrooms of the Learning Lab sites than the introduction of "action research." Why this is so is clear to those who study current organizational effectiveness - action research has caused people to make decisions about their work processes based upon actual data!

A recent hot topic among many school improvement junkies has been the move to a site-based shared decision making model. The emphasis in much of this has been exclusively on moving decisions closer to the bottom of the pyramid and on involving all stakeholders in the process. Both of these are laudable goals, but, as Deming would likely and readily point out, neither purpose guarantees the improved quality of the decisions to be made. Enlarging

the decision making circle does increase the chance of broad-based consensus, does increase the prospect that more people "feel good" about the decision, and does increase broad-based ownership of the decision and of a commitment to implementation. All of these factors will quite likely have some positive impact on general organizational effectiveness. However, the factor above all these which will assure the highest quality decisions is the existence of relevant and timely information and the skills of information analysis. The extent to which decisions are based upon data, according to quality theorists, insures an organization's long-term effectiveness. We have found our Labs generally stuck in a paradigm of decision making centered around the dominance of political influence and the power of position.

In order to reach the full potential of data-based decision making, those making decisions must not only have access to data from sources outside their direct control (i.e., the central office), but must have the full capacity to generate data themselves. Data based decision making, as powerful as it appears it should be, will only achieve full potential if it occurs in a supportive climate adhering to the other principles discussed in this paper.

13. Efforts to learn and improve must be total, dynamic, and generative.

The concept of Total Quality Management (TQM) is receiving, quite justifiably, much attention as one remedy for curing United States global competitiveness (Neuroth, 1992; Walton, 1989). It is also being touted as having much to offer school improvement efforts. Much of the rhetoric about TQM appears to focus on defining "quality" and redefining "management." Left out of the discussion is the first word - "total." Indeed, it is the "totality" of the scope of effort and change that separates TQM from other improvement strategies. Fixing the system requires that **everybody** behave differently. It also requires that one philosophy of what quality behavior is pervades everything. This is why it must fully involve the "top." Improvement efforts which stress only what teachers must do differently (get tested, take more content courses, follow some prescriptive instructional strategy, etc.), what parents should do differently (attend PTA meetings, volunteer more, read more to their children, etc.), what management should do differently (be more democratic, become better instructional leaders,

become better motivators, etc.), or what students themselves must do differently (watch less television, take homework more seriously, eat and rest more responsibly, etc.), come out of the old competitive paradigm where the focus is generally on fixing blame rather than on fixing the system.

The effort to learn and improve must be dynamic in the sense that it is highly energized and continuously pursued. The need for the effort to be "total," speaks to the scope of the effort. The call for the effort to be dynamic refers to the intensity and persistence with which it must be pursued. Successful efforts seem to be marked by a sense that it is always in gear **every place** and **all the time.** Paradigm shifts will certainly not occur only as a result of monthly meetings to discuss how change might take place, only to end with everyone returning to work environments and processes largely as they always have been. Dynamic change is present when people leave most professional gatherings committed to immediately engaging in different professional behaviors aimed at improvement. We have observed the players in most Labs as viewing meetings as something to be reluctantly accepted as an obligation. They do not approach meetings with an expectation that anyone (least of all "me") is to behave differently tomorrow.

Lastly, efforts to learn and improve must be systemically generative rather than adaptive in nature (McGill, Slocum, & Lei, 1992). That is, they must be more than simply responsive to provocation from outside the system, more than adaptive to market pressures, more than incremental in their approach to learning. They must be internally generative in that they must be constantly seeking new and improved processes irrespective of, but not unaligned with, external provocation and expressed needs. They must learn how to learn, to look over the long term, and to view change as an opportunity. A TQM example of this would be moving from customer satisfaction to customer delight. With customer satisfaction one listens and responds by giving the customer what they request. With customer delight one listens carefully, interprets and projects, and gives the customer more than they asked for or expected. Providing customer delight requires generative thinking. Generative thinking

speaks to the depth of the change effort. It is a harsh reality that our experience is that the Labs are not even very conscious of the need to be adaptive, much less generative.

In summary, the efforts to learn and improve must be total (in scope), dynamic (in intensity), and generative (in depth). The Learning Laboratories Initiative envisions systemic change consistent with the principles discussed above, and our experience thus far indicates that all these principles must be adhered to. A recent report from a study of school leadership (National Center for School Leadership, 1992) as displayed by superintendents and principals in schools with reputed successful school reform vision and progress, states:

> ...progress in these schools is less dependent on one person - such as the principal - and more dependent on the relationships among principals, teachers, district administrators and community members. These groups jointly construct the school's mission through dialogue as well as action, suggesting that school leadership be described as a *process* involving many individuals.

This conclusion is just one more example of the recognition of the complexity of the systems we call schools. Note also that the quote refers to leadership not as a trait but as a "*process*." How many schools or districts have mapped their *process of leadership* or even thought of it in those terms? We suggest the answer is, "Not many!" The efforts to systemically change schools, of which the NEA Learning Laboratories Initiative is one broad-scale example, are teaching us many new lessons. One lesson learned is that you don't really know whether you have a new "system" in place until all the original players are gone and the system remains. The combined theories of systems thinking and continuous improvement mean that if one's goal is "to have a new system in place" is to deny the premise of constant improvement. This is so because since the system itself must change and improve - the system becomes a way of thinking and not a constant state. Albert Einstein said, "The release of the power of the atom changed everything - everything but our way of thinking." It can also be said that understanding systems releases a power which certainly changes our thinking.

Categories of Activity from the Rapporteur Reports

Praises and Nudges

As described above, the Rapporteur Reports are formative documents created at the learning Lab sites without a preliminary model. Thus, they reflect the observations of the Rapporteur Team members organized around Praises and Nudges. When the nine completed reports were analyzed, 12 categories of Praises and 12 categories of Nudges emerged. The subitems in each category lend more specificity to the activities. The Praises are listed in Table 4 and the Nudges are listed in Table 5.

These categories of activity provide a picture of strengths and weaknesses, progress and challenges, in these nine districts at the end of their second year. The categories themselves may not be surprising to anyone with knowledge of educational change. Most of them are discussed in the literature. They are particularly important here because the categories comprise a comprehensive list arising from actual restructuring sites. This gives some reality-based legitimacy to the categories and some concreteness and clarity to what is generally a very murky process.

One way to look at these data is by site. Of the nine sites, three received Praises in all 12 categories. Even the lowest received Praises in 3/4 of the categories. For the Nudges, one site received Nudges in all 12 categories and three received Nudges in 11 categories with 9 being the lowest. Thus, Praises are spread across categories and across sites, as is also the case with Nudges. Again, the subitems add specificity and provide a more wholistic picture of the dynamics within each site. In many cases, a site received both praises and nudges in the same category indicating that progress has been made, but challenges remain. The one subitem that shows a Praise in all nine sites, Skill/Staff Development, is also the one subitem that shows a Nudge from every site.

Another way to look at the data is by category. Most of the major categories were addressed in all nine sites. For Praises, "Communication" and "Documentation/Evaluation" were addressed in only 5 and 4 of the sites respectively, indicating that these may be the

weakest cumulative areas of progress. Again, the subitems help to show more variation among the sites than the broader categories can. One unexpectedly strong area is "Progress: Students Impact" with seven sites receiving praise (and four receiving nudges). This provides a glimpse of positive, important, and often missing information on the question of whether students are being affected by restructuring.

Combined Category Listing

As we thought about the potential of these categories for guiding and/or assessing district-level change, the two lists, one of Praises and one of Nudges, became cumbersome. So the lists were combined resulting in one list of categories and subcategories that encompasses all the items from both the Praises and Nudges lists (Table 6). This list of categories of activity can now be used in any number of ways to guide and/or assess district-level change processes. As we continue to map new Rapporteur Report data onto the categories, we will use P's and N's (for Praises and Nudges, respectively) on one sheet rather than using two separate sheets. This will make it easier to get a full picture of activity at one glance.

A Framework for District-Level Change: Principles and Activities

At one of our initial feedback sessions, a teacher asked in response to the principles, "How do we get consensus on purpose?" From that question, we deduced that the principles, which are very general in nature, needed some specificity in terms of how to operationally address the principles. The categories of activity gleaned from our sites seemed to address this need. The result is the Framework of Principles and Activities seen in Table 7. Each principle has categories of activity appropriate to addressing that principle, a combination of general principles from the literature and corresponding activities from the sites. The subitems listed in Table 6 add even more specificity.

Finally, we compared the principles against the categories of activity just to get a sense of their juxtaposition. As might be expected, there is considerable overlap indicating the murkiness of the change process. At the same time, the table might be helpful in keeping track of what is related to what. The category "Change Processes/Skills" is relevant to almost

every principle. "Progress" is listed under the fewest number of principles. This one may be more useful as a Rapporteuring item than as a guide to achieving a principle, since evidence of progress should ideally be an activity built into each principle and category.

Implications

We believe this framework of principles and activities will be useful in several ways. First, the framework can serve as a guide to systemic school change efforts. For beginning and advanced projects, it might be particularly useful as a planning guide as sites consider where to focus energy and activity.

Secondly, the framework can serve as an documentation, evaluation, or assessment tool. Sites might use it to systematically look at where strengths and weaknesses lie, and what areas might be helpful in addressing particular problems. For example, if personality problems appear to be hampering progress, shared purpose, commitment to change, skill development, and individual affirmation may require attention. For our purposes, we are starting to experiment with using the framework for conducting and organizing future Rapporteur Reports.

Thirdly, the framework is useful to the Center staff in assessing our own work. It enables us to look at the progress and needs of our sites which is helpful in our planning and resource allocation. It also serves as a tool for self-reflection. For example, we have four "vehicles" that we use to forward the work of our sites. We have conducted training in each of these vehicles and seek to encourage their use. The vehicles are action research, the School Renewal Network, the Continua, and the Rapporteur Process. The first three are listed in the Categories of Activity subitems. However, a look at the data indicate that we have not mentioned these vehicles, as either Praises or Nudges, in most of the sites. Are we really encouraging these vehicles as much as we think? Are we not missing an important opportunity to suggest the use of these vehicles by leaving them out of the Rapporteur Reports? There is a perfect opportunity here for us to implement the principle of data-based decision making.

References

Covey, S. R. (1989). 7 habits of highly effective people. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Dolan, W. P. (1989). Total system collaboration for site based decision making workshop. Overland Park, KS: W. P. Dolan & Associates.

Dolan, W. P. (1989). The pyramid organization. Unpublished paper. Overland Park, KS: W. P. Dolan & Associates.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Holly, P. (1990). School-based development in action. Unpublished manuscript.

Johnson, B. M. (1992). Documentation and evaluation of school restructuring: Dilemmas of a new paradigm. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Kerchner, C. T., Koppich, J. E., & King, B. (undated). Smart work & smart workers. Claremont, CA: Claremont Project Vision, Claremont Graduate School.

Livingston, C. L., & Castle, S. (1992). Restructuring schools: New tensions and dilemmas teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

McClure, R. (1991). Individual growth and institutional renewal. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.) Staff Development for education in the 90's: New demands, new realities, new perspectives (second edition), pp. 221-242. New York: Teachers College Press.

McDonnell, L. M., & Pascal, A. (1988). Teacher unions and educational reform. Washington, D.C: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education and The Rand Corporation.

McGill, M. E., Slocum, J. W., Jr., & Lei, D. (1992). Management Practices in Learning Organizations. In Organizational dynamics. New York, NY: American Management Association.

National Center for School Leadership. (1992, Fall). leadership and learning. Champaign-Urbana: University of Illinois.

Neuroth, J. (1992). TQM handbook. Arlington, VA: American Association Of School Administrators.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline. New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.

Tribus, M. (1992). TQM in education: The theory and how To put it to use. Unpublished paper.

Walton, M. (1986). The Deming management method. New York, NY: The Putnam Publishing Group.

Table 1

Elements of Systemic Change by Author

DEMING Fourteen points	FULLAN Lessons on change	SARASON Requirements for confronting historical intractability	NEUROTH The TQM Handbook Baldrige criteria
1. Establish constancy of purpose	1. Can't mandate what matters	1. Evidence of critical thinking	1. Leadership at the top
2. Adopt a new philosophy	2. Change is a journey, not a blueprint	2. Evidence of system-wide changes	2. Information and analysis resides at all levels
3. Cease dependence on mass inspection	3. Problems are friends & part of the process	3. Evidence of altered power relationships	3. Strategic planning and goal setting occurs based upon continuous customer scanning and processes benchmarking
4. Don't buy materials on price alone	4. Vision & strategic planning come later	4. Evidence of developing learning communities	4. Human resource capacities at all levels are developed toward quality
5. Constantly seek to improve processes	5. Individualism & collectivism must have equal power	TRIBUS Elements of concern for holistic management	5. Manages process quality across the organization
6. Establish regular training/retraining	6. Neither centralization nor decentralization works alone	1. Philosophy	6. Tracks and analyzes operational quality indicators and results
7. Define and establish leadership	7. Changing schools find new connections	2. Vision	7. Continuously scans customer base for satisfaction and future needs
8. Drive out fear	8. Each person must be own change agent	3. Strategy	
9. Eliminate communication barriers/structures		4. Skills	
10. Eliminate slogans and targets		5. Resources	
11. Eliminate quotas		6. Rewards	
12. Eliminate barriers to pride in work		7. Organization	
13. Educate & retrain			
14. Take action for transformation			
+ Decide based on data			

Table 2

Elements & Principles

Elements		Principles												
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Deming	1	X												
	2		X											
	3												X	
	4								X					
	5										X			X
	6					X								
	7				X									
	8						X							
	9											X		
	10										X			
	11										X			
	12						X							
	13					X								
	14				X									
	15												X	
Fullan	1						X							
	2										X			
	3			X										
	4		X											
	5									X				
	6									X				
	7											X		X
	8						X	X		X				
Sarason	1	X	X	X					X					
	2						X	X					X	
	3				X		X	X						
	4						X	X	X	X		X		X
Tribus	1	X	X											
	2	X	X	X										
	3					X	X		X		X			
	4					X								
	5					X								
	6											X	X	
	7						X	X			X	X	X	X
Neuroth	1				X									
	2											X	X	
	3	X	X	X					X				X	X
	4			X	X	X							X	X
	5										X			
	6												X	X
	7							X	X			X	X	

Table 3

Summary of Principles by Author

Author	Principle													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total
Deming	1	1	0	2	2	2	0	1	0	4	1	1	1	16
Fullan	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	3	2	1	0	3	14
Sarason	1	1	1	1	0	3	3	2	1	0	1	1	3	18
Tribus	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	1	0	2	2	3	0	19
Neuroth	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	2	0	1	2	5	3	21
Total	5	6	5	5	6	10	6	6	4	9	7	10	10	

Table 4 Categories of Activity: Praises by Site

Praises	RI	TN	IA	MN	OH	NY	OK	PA	MI	SUM
ATTITUDE/AFFECT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Trust	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		8
Risktaking	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	7
Pride	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	7
Improved Morale				X	X		X	X	X	5
Excitement		X			X		X	X		4
Renewed Energy		X	X	X	X		X		X	6
Hope			X							2
LL as Catalyst				X	X		X	X	X	5
Respect			X	X			X			3
Innovation			X				X		X	3
OPENNESS TO CHANGE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Openness		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		7
Letting Go				X	X	X	X			4
Desire Improvement	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Desire Collaboration		X		X	X					3
Supportive Environ			X				X			2
CHANGE PROCESS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Continuous Inquiry	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	7
Shared Vision			X	X			X	X	X	5
Shared Strategy			X	X			X	X		4
Pace			X	X	X					3
Ownership					X	X	X			3
Teambuilding			X		X					2
Facilitation			X	X						2
DECISION MAKING	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Working to agreemt	X		X				X		X	4
Consensus DM		X	X							2
District structure	X		X		X	X	X			5
School structures	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		7
Decentralized $$						X	X		X	3
TRANSFORMAT'L LDSP	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	8
Central office/Supt			X	X		X	X			3
Principals			X	X			X	X	X	5
Teachers	X		X	X						3
Parents		X								1
Emerging Ldsp	X		X			X	X	X		5
Listening/Learning				X						1
AUTHENTIC INVOLV	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	7
Teachers	X	X		X		X	X		X	6
Parents		X				X				2
Students							X			1

Table 4 (continued)

Praises	RI	TN	IA	MN	OH	NY	OK	PA	MI	SUM
STAKEHOLDER INVOLV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Community		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
Board of Ed			X	X		X	X	X	X	6
Parents	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			7
Business			X		X	X		X		4
Central Office	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		8
Support Staff	X					X	X			3
Educ. Association	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Teachers	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Principals		X	X	X		X	X	X		6
Higher Ed		X	X	X	X	X				5
Students			X		X		X			3
Senior Citizens					X	X				2
PROFESS'L CLIMATE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Skill/Staff Devel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Data-based decision				X				X	X	3
School Renewal Net					X					1
Collaboration		X	X	X			X	X	X	6
Dialogue	X		X			X	X	X	X	6
PROGRESS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Facultyness	X						X		X	3
Districtness	X		X							2
Student Impact		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	7
COMMUNICATION	X	X	X			X	X			5
External						X				1
To uninvolved			X							1
Among involved	X		X				X			3
DOCUMENTATION/EVAL		X	X	X			X			4
Formative			X	X			X			3
Summative			X							1
Internal		X	X				X			3
External		X	X		X	X	X			5
RESOURCES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Human		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	7
Time		X	X	X				X		4
Money		X			X		X	X		4
Facilities								X		1
Technology	X				X			X		3
SUMMARY X	11	12	12	11	8	11	12	9	10	
X	22	26	44	37	32	31	45	31	24	

Table 5 Categories of Activity: Nudges by Site

Nudges	RI	TN	IA	MN	OH	NY	OK	PA	MI	SUM
ATTITUDE/AFFECT	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	7
Empowerment		X			X	X				3
Trust	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	7
OPENNESS TO CHANGE	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	7
Decrease Resistance	X	X		X		X			X	5
Tradition as Opport	X	X		X			X	X	X	6
Conflict as Opport					X		X			2
CHANGE PROCESS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Shared Vision	X			X	X		X	X	X	6
Shared Strategies	X			X	X	X			X	5
Focus/Priorities	X			X	X	X		X	X	6
What NOT to do	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	7
Common Language	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		8
Systemic thinking							X	X		2
Pace			X	X		X	X	X	X	6
Dips		X							X	2
Ambiguity		X					X		X	3
Expanding Pilots		X				X		X		3
Process AND Content			X							1
Celebrations/Humor		X				X	X	X	X	5
Broad Ownership					X	X		X		3
Facilitation	X	X	X						X	4
Team Building		X			X			X	X	4
Continuous Inquiry		X						X		2
DECISION MAKING	X	X	X		X	X			X	6
Decisions implemented	X	X				X			X	4
Spheres clarified	X	X	X		X	X			X	6
Strong structures	X	X			X				X	4
Flattening hierarchy		X	X							2
Waiver process		X	X							2
Integrated structure			X							1
TRANSFORMAT'L LDSP	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Teachers		X			X		X	X		4
Supt/Central office			X					X	X	3
Principals	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	7
Union-management	X		X				X	X	X	5
Top-down/bottom-up				X		X				2
Constly redistributed	X								X	2
Listening/Learning	X	X			X	X		X	X	6
Personnel changes		X							X	2
Selection process	X		X					X	X	4
AUTHENTIC INVOLVE	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	8
Input vs. Dec Making	X		X		X	X				4
Beyond lip-service		X	X	X	X	X				5
Teacher voice		X		X	X				X	4
Student voice	X									1
Parents as partners	X				X	X		X	X	5

Table 5 (continued)

Nudges	RI	TN	IA	MN	OH	NY	OK	PA	MI	SUM
STAKEHOLDER INVOLMT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Teachers					X					1
Parents	X				X	X	X	X		5
Superintendents										0
Principals					X	X				2
Higher education	X				X		X			3
Business					X				X	2
Community	X				X			X	X	4
Students	X				X		X		X	4
Educ Association							X	X		2
Board of Ed		X								1
Support staff	X				X					2
Letting others in	X					X				2
Expanding the circle	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	7
PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Skill/Staff develop	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Data-based decisions	X	X				X	X		X	5
School Renewal Network		X	X				X		X	4
Lack of Jealousy						X	X			2
Dialogue	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
Role redefinition				X					X	2
PROGRESS	X	X	X			X	X	X		6
Facultyness										0
Districtness							X			1
Cooperation among sch		X	X			X				3
Student Impact	X	X	X					X		4
Changing demographics						X				1
All schools alike?		X				X		X		3
COMMUNICATION	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
To uninvolved			X	X	X	X	X	X		7
Among involved	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		8
External			X	X	X	X	X	X		7
Networking		X			X	X	X		X	5
Process/structure	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	7
DOCUMENTATION & EVAL	X	X	X	X	X			X		6
Of LL progress			X	X	X			X		4
Action research	X	X		X	X					4
Of students	X				X			X		3
Of teachers	X	X						X		3
External	X	X	X	X					4	
RESOURCES	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	9
Time	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	8
Money	X	X		X	X			X		5
Glass half full	X		X	X						3
SUMMARY X	11	12	10	9	10	11	9	11	10	
X	39	37	29	24	40	34	29	37	37	

Table 6

Categories of Activity: Combined List

---

1. **ATTITUDINAL/AFFECTIVE CONDITIONS**
   - Trust
   - Risktaking
   - Pride
   - High/improved morale
   - Excitement
   - Renewed Energy
   - Hope
   - Respect
   - Learning Lab designation as catalyst
   - Creativity/Innovation
   - Empowerment

2. **OPENNESS TO CHANGE**
   - Openness
   - Willingness to let go
   - Desire to improve schools
   - Desire to improve adversarial relationships
   - Supportive environment
   - Decreasing resistance
   - Tradition as opportunity
   - Conflict as opportunity

3. **CHANGE PROCESS/SKILLS**
   - Continuous improvement/inquiry
   - Shared vision
   - Shared strategy, focus, action plans
   - Pace
   - Dips
   - Ambiguity
   - Teambuilding
   - Critical Friend/Facilitation
   - What NOT to do
   - Common language
   - Systemic thinking
   - Expanding pilot programs
   - Balance between process and substance
   - Celebrations/Humor

Table 6 (Continued)

4. **DECISION MAKING STRUCTURES**
   - Working toward agreement
   - Consensus decision making
   - Decisions implemented
   - District structure
   - Site/school-based structures
   - Spheres of decision making clarified
   - Decentralized budgeting
   - No additional hierarchy
   - Waiver process
   - Integration of old and new structures
   - Selection of participants/leaders

5. **TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**
   - Superintendent/Central office
   - Principals
   - Teachers
   - Parents
   - Emerging Leadership
   - Listening & Learning
   - Union-management collaboration
   - Top-down and bottom-up
   - "Constantly redistributed"
   - Personnel changes

6. **AUTHENTICITY OF INVOLVEMENT**
   - Teachers
   - Parents
   - Students
   - Input vs. decision making
   - Beyond lip service

7. **STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT/COMMITMENT**
   - Community
   - Board of Education
   - Parents
   - Business
   - Superintendent/Central Office
   - Support staff
   - Education Association
   - Teachers
   - Principals
   - Higher Education
   - Students
   - Senior citizens
   - Expanding the circle
   - Broad ownership

Table 6 (Continued)

8. **PROFESSIONAL CLIMATE**
   Staff/Skill development; Capacity-building
   Knowledge-based decisions
   School Renewal Network
   Collegiality/Collaboration
   Dialogue
   Lack of jealousy/personality problems

9. **PROGRESS**
   Facultyness
   Districtness
   Student impact
   Cooperation among schools
   Response to changing demographics
   Must all schools be alike?

10. **COMMUNICATION**
    External
    To the "uninvolved"
    Among the "involved"
    Networking
    Processes and structures

11. **DOCUMENTATION & EVALUATION**
    Formative
    Summative
    Internal
    External/responsibility to educ community
    Action research
    Continua
    Of LL progress
    Of students
    Of teachers

12. **RESOURCES**
    Human
    Time
    Money
    Facilities
    Technology
    Glass half full, not half empty

11. Communication barriers must be eradicated

    Change Process/Skills

    Decision Making Structures

    Transformational Leadership

    Professional Climate

    Communication

12. Data-based decision making must be required and enabled

    Change Process/Skills

    Decision Making Structures

    Authenticity of Involvement

    Professional Climate

    Documentation & Evaluation

    Resources

13. Efforts to learn and improve must be total, dynamic, and generative

    Change Process/Skills

    Decision Making Structures

    Transformational Leadership

    Authenticity of Involvement

    Professional Climate

    Progress

    Communication

    Documentation & Evaluation

Transformational Leadership

Authenticity of Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment

Progress

Communication

8. Partner-customer-supplier relationships must be consciously developed

Change Process/Skills

Decision Making Structures

Transformational Leadership

Authenticity of Involvement

Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment

Professional Climate

9. Individual affirmation must be balanced with collaboration

Attitudinal/Affective Conditions

Openness to Change

Change Process/Skills

Decision Making Structures

Professional Climate

Progress

10. Processes, at all levels, must be emphasized over end results

Change Process/Skills

Decision Making Structures

Communication

Documentation & Evaluation

4. The "top" must demonstrate the envisioned change

   Decision Making Structures

   Transformational Leadership

   Authenticity of Involvement

   Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment

5. Significant new investments and commitment must be made in educating/training prospective participants in the new theory and philosophy and relevant skills.

   Change Process/Skills

   Professional Climate

   Documentation & Evaluation

   Resources

6. Participation in the new processes and approaches must be voluntary and active

   Attitudinal/Affective Conditions

   Openness to Change

   Change Process/Skills

   Decision Making Structures

   Transformational Leadership

   Authenticity of Involvement

   Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment

   Professional Climate

   Communication

7. Power sources and relationships must be visibly altered

   Attitudinal/Affective Conditions

   Openness to Change

   Change Process/Skills

   Decision Making Structures

Table 7

Framework of Principles and Activities

---

1. Purpose must be clearly articulated and widely known and owned
   - Attitudinal/Affective Conditions
   - Change Process/Skills
   - Transformational Leadership
   - Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment
   - Professional Climate
   - Communication

2. Purpose must be based upon a consciously developed philosophy rooted in shared theory
   - Attitudinal/Affective Conditions
   - Change Process/Skills
   - Decision Making Structures
   - Transformational Leadership
   - Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment
   - Professional Climate

3. Need for change must be broadly understood and accepted
   - Attitudinal/Affective Conditions
   - Openness to Change
   - Change Process/Skills
   - Authenticity of Involvement
   - Stakeholder Involvement/Commitment
   - Communication
   - Documentation & Evaluation
   - Resources

Table 8

Comparison of Principles & Categories of Activity

Categories	Principle													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total
1	X	X	X			X	X		X					6
2			X			X	X		X					4
3	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	12
4		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
5	X	X		X		X	X	X			X		X	8
6			X	X		X	X	X				X	X	7
7	X	X	X	X		X	X	X						7
8	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	10
9									X				X	2
10	X		X			X	X			X	X		X	7
11			X		X					X		X	X	5
12			X		X							X		3
TOTAL	6	6	8	4	4	9	9	6	6	4	5	6	8	

Appendix A

Comparison of Evaluation Paradigms

*A COMPARISON OF EVALUATION PARADIGMS

"Old" Paradigm	"New" Paradigm
teacher as passive recipients/objects	teachers as active participants/subjects/partners
R, D, & D	collaborative inquiry
externally controlled	internally controlled
external change agents, developers, improvers innovators, evaluators	internal change agents, developers, improvers innovators, evaluators
external accountability	internal accountability
added-on	built-in
avoids the complexity of the school's culture	springs from within the school's culture
evaluation "of" (one dimension)	evaluation "as, for, of" (three dimensions)
linear	cyclical
singular reality	multiple realities
convergent, fragmented	divergent, inter-related
responds to one predetermined organizer/model	can accommodate any other organizer/model
a priori design	emerging, evolving design
judgmental feedback	continuous, informal feedback
springs from experimental psychology	springs from anthropology, journalism, even poetry
reactive	reflective, responsive
scientific	naturalistic
contrived	realistic
values uniformity	values diversity
summative	formative
following	leading
restrictive	liberating
Metaphor: Teaching	Metaphor: Learning

Appendix B

Rapporteur Schedule and Interview Questions

SCHEDULE OVERVIEW FOR THE RAPPORTEUR VISIT

3/8 **Evening of Team's arrival:** The Rapporteur Team will meet with Evaluation Coordinator and the Project Coordinator for debriefing, discussion of the interview schedule and logistical information, final review/revision of interview questions, etc.

3/9 **First Day:** Rapporteur Team conducts <u>INTERNAL</u> interviews (see below)

3/9 **First Evening:** Team meets to reflect on what they have heard and experienced, and to begin analysis of data.

3/10 **Second Day:** Team conducts <u>EXTERNAL</u> interviews (see below).

3/10 **Second Evening:** Team meets to continue data analysis.

3/11 **Third Day (morning):** Team prepares oral report.

3/11 **Third Day (early afternoon):** Team presents/discusses findings with interested stakeholders. This session should be about 90 minutes. Videotaping is suggested.

* <u>INTERNAL Interviews</u>: These are people inside your district. You should arrange for as broad a sampling base as possible. For instance; we would want to talk with central office personnel, principals, students, teachers, the evaluation coordinator, and support staff. In our experience we find you will receive much greater benefit from this process if you select people for interviewing that are at various levels of involvement in your restructuring agenda. There is a richness in gathering disparate points of view. Therefore, you should include current leaders as well as past leaders; involved personnel as well as non-involved or less-involved; people from very active schools as well as people from less active ones, etc.

** <u>EXTERNAL Interviews</u>: Here, we are referring to the larger arena of stakeholders...such as parents, local media personnel, folks from local higher education institutions, local business people, local and/or state association officers, School Board members or other policymakers, etc. As suggested above, you will learn much more if you try to bring in the leaders and non-leaders, supporters and non-supporters.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR INTERNAL INTERVIEWS:

While the following questions serve as a starting point for the interview sessions, the Rapporteur Team will let the respondents lead the session in the direction it should go - sharing their unique perspectives concerning your district's work.

Our oral and written reports will not address these specific questions, but will build upon information received from these questions to address the more key issues and elements of school restructuring/transformation (e.g.: communications, stakeholder involvement, training, etc.)

1. How do you feel things have changed for you personally, and for your district, in the last two years since being designated a Learning Lab?

2. What things have facilitated the change progress? In what ways? (Nothing is too insignificant to name.)

3. What have been the most formidable barriers or obstacles to progress and how have you dealt with them? (Again, please don't fail to mention something because you assume it would be insignificant to us. It isn't!)

4. What do you identify as the priorities/needs for the continuing work of your district?

5. What is/are the guiding purpose(s) or the "vision" for your Learning Lab?

6. Revisit your district's application for becoming a Learning Lab. Look again at the original purposes(s). If the purposes have changed - how have they changed and why?

7. What specific short-range goals have been established in your Lab? What progress has been made thus far toward realizing those goals? Explain how accomplishing those goals will move your district toward its purpose (vision).

8. What have we not asked that is important for us to know and for you to tell us?

NOTE: Questions 1-8 above were formulated by the Center staff in order to collect similar data across all Learning Lab sites; this to give us the "big picture" of school restructuring. However, if there are specific questions your particular Lab would like to add please do so - we want to collect the information considered most important in your context.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR EXTERNAL INTERVIEWS:

While the following questions serve as a starting point for the interview sessions, the Rapporteur Team will let the respondents lead the session in the direction it should go - sharing their unique perspectives concerning your district's work.

Our oral and written reports will not address these specific questions, but will build upon information received from these questions to address the more key issues and elements of school restructuring/transformation (e.g.: communication, stakeholder involvement, training, etc.)

1. What is your perception of what it means for this school district to be identified as a NEA-Learning Lab?

2. To what extent, and in what ways, have you/your business/your enterprise been involved wit the Learning Lab initiative?

3. What are other ways you could assist in the work which have not been utilized thus far?

4. What has facilitated your involvement? What have been the obstacles?

5. What is your perception of this district's long range vision (purpose) and how they plan to accomplish the vision?

6. What would you personally identify as the priorities for the future work of this school district?

NOTE: Questions 1-6 above were formulated by the Center staff for the purpose of collecting similar information across all Learning Lab sites. We encourage each site to add their own questions to the list to get at the specific information you are most interested in in relation to your work.

EXTQUES.DOC